UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,478	07/18/2006	Tetsuya Ogata	R2184.0525/P525	4172
24998 DICKSTEIN SI	7590 02/26/201 HAPIRO LLP	EXAMINER		
1825 EYE STR		FISCHER, MARK L		
Washington, DO	20000-3403		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2627	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/26/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/586,478	OGATA, TETSUYA	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Mark Fischer	2627	

	Mark Fischer	2627	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 February 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS .	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red		ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE:	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.125. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		·	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. ☐ Other: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive and the amendment to the specification will be entered and claims 1-8 a	refore the Final rejection stands. F		
/HOA T NGUYEN/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2627	/Mark L Fischer/ Examiner, Art Unit 2627		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that "[a]ccording to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary [...], the word adjacent 'always implies absence of anything of the same kind in between." and that "[t]hus, 'adjacent' is different from 'close' or 'near,' which simply imply a short distance." While the examiner understands the point that applicant is making, the portion cited from the Merriam-Webster Dictionary that "the word adjacent 'always implies absence of anything of the same kind in between" is not found in all dictionaries, and therefore cannot be used to rule out all other definitions of the word "adjacent" found in other dictionaries, which may also be applied when determining the scope of the claims. For example, http://dictionary.reference.com (see attached), which provides definitions of "adjacent" taken from the Random House Dictionary and The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, defines "adjacent" with such definitions as "close to," "lying near," and "neighboring" and does not make mention of anything along the lines of the word "adjacent" "always implies absence of anything of the same kind in between." Thus, applicant's arguments are not persuasive.